

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/755,661	LONGUEVILLE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Drew J. Brown	3616	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Drew J. Brown. (3)_____.

(2) Denise Poy. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 03 August 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 12, and 13.

Identification of prior art discussed: Perry (U.S. Pat. No. 5366036), Richardson et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5617929), and Palmeri et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6065560).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Examiner proposed an Examiner's Amendment that would have placed the application in condition for allowance. The proposed Examiner's Amendment was the following:

In line 6 of claim 1, "configured to be" should be removed.

In line 12 of claim 1, "by said" should be changed to --below said--.

In line 5 of claim 12, "portion to" should be changed to --portion directly to--.

In line 9 of claim 12, "by said" should be changed to --below said--.

In line 6 of claim 13, "is connectable" should be changed to --is directly connected--.

In line 8 of claim 13, "by said" should be changed to --below said--.